Sutherland

Asbill & Brennan LLP

ROBERT A GUTKIN DIRECT LINE: 202383.0751 E-mail: robert gutkin@sablaw.com

USDS SDNY	
DOCUMENT ELECTRONICALLY FILED	
DATE FILED:	17 19/07

1275 Pennsylvapia Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20004-2415 202.383.0100 (ax 202.637.3593 www.sablaw.com

13/19/00

I certain the

December 19, 2007

MEMO ENDORSED

VIA FACSIMILE

The Honorable Colleen McMahon United States District Court Southern District of New York 500 Pearl Street, Room 640 New York, NY 10007

Re: Leighton Technologies LLC v. Oberthur Card Systems, S.A., et al

Case No. 04 Civ. 02496 (CM)(LMS)

Dear Judge McMahon:

This responds to Oberthur's December 19, 2007 letter to Your Honor. There is absolutely nothing improper about Leighton's letter, and no need for additional letters.

Oberthur chose to focus its letter on case merit issues (i.e. trying to establish that Motorola employees conceived the inventions) rather than standing; requesting a sua sponte change of inventorship; and, requesting a sua sponte grant of summary judgment of invalidity.

Leighton chose to focus its letter on the precise motion before the Court, standing, based upon the Court's invitation in its December 3, 2007 letter for comment on:

- 1. "[i]t is possible to conclude from the evidence that Mr. Leighton did not conceive of 'his' invention at all."
- 2. How would such a finding "impact on the precise motion I am trying to decide?"

Leighton's letter focuses on the problems faced by having evidence on merit issues entwined with evidence on standing.

WO 835722.1

Allanta Austin Houston New York Tallahassee Washington, DC

The Honorable Colleen McMahon December 19, 2007 Page 2

Both letters address the December 3, 2007 letter of the Court, albeit in different ways, and additional letters simply are not necessary.

Respectfully,

Robert A Gutkin

The Honorable Lisa Margaret Smith (via Federal Express)
 Kevin Johnson, Esq. (via E-mail)
 Edward DeFranco, Esq. (via E-mail)
 Mark Baker, Esq. (via E-mail)